REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks.

ermoplastic polyolefin material is the ermoplastic polyolefin interpolymer, and herein the thermoplastic polyolefin erpolymer is an ethylene/styrene
erein the thermoplastic polyolefin
ernolymer is an ethylene/styrene
erpolymer.
The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet, Original claim 1.
coating according to claim 1 wherein the
rmoplastic polyolefin material is the

Page 38, lines 16-18.
Page 38, lines 16-18.
1 450 50, 18805 10-10.
D 20 1: - 22 25
Page 38, lines 22-27.
Page 38, lines 22-27.
Page 38, lines 22-27.
Page 38, lines 22-27.
2 - 18 - 30, 11103 22 27.
Page 38, lines 22-27.
1 age 30, times 22-27.
Original claim 1.
Original claim 1.
Original claim 1.
Original claim 5.
~
Page 3, lines 27-28.
1 450 5, tilles 27-20.
Original plain 4
Original claim 4.
` · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
0::11: 6
Original claim 7.

Serial No.:10/031,302

provide the second seco	
subjected to corona treatment.	
52. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Page 3, lines 28-30.
or coating according to claim 1 wherein the	
surface microstructure is on two sides.	
53. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Page 3, lines 24-25.
or coating according to claim 1 wherein the	
surface microstructure covers a part of the	
surface of the layer.	'
54. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Page 3, lines 24-25.
or coating according to claim 1 wherein the	
surface microstructure covers all of the surface	
of the layer.	
55. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Original claim 1.
or coating according to claim 1 in the form of a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
mono-layer.	
56. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Original claim 1.
or coating according to claim 1 in the form of a	Original Oldini 1.
multi-layer.	
57. The mono-layer or multi-layer film, sheet,	Page 57
or coating according to claim 1 in the form of a	Page 57, example 1.
three-layer film.	

2. The §112, ¶2 Rejection

Claims 1 and 24-57 were rejected under §112, ¶2. The examiner objected to the terms "substantially solid" and "fibril-like" as vague and indefinite.

With respect to the term "fibril-like," this phrase has been deleted from claim 1, which is believe to overcome this ground of rejection.

On the other hand, "substantially solid" remains in the claim. This phrase is fully supported in the specification at page 38, lines 5-8. This passage states that

The fringes are substantially solid aberrations, e.g., as opposed to hollow or partially hollow protrusions. This means that the fringes are compact structures substantially entirely filled with and consisting of the thermoplastic material forming the fringed layer, possibly slightly grooved at the top.

In light of the specification, the phrase "substantially solid" is neither vague nor indefinite. Accordingly, the rejection under §112, ¶2 should be withdrawn.

Serial No.:10/031,302

3. The §103 rejection based on STREET in view of GRUBER ET AL.

Claims 1, 24-35, 37-48, and 50-57 were rejected under §103 based on STREET (US 3,696,183) in view of GRUBER ET AL. (US 5,484,881). The examiner basically asserted that it would be obvious to use the poly(lactide) of GRUBER ET AL. in the process of STREET to form a fibril-bearing film. Applicant disagrees.

In the first instance, STREET neither teaches nor suggests a mono-layer or multilayer film, sheet, or coating wherein at least one layer displays a surface microstructure wherein the fringes are substantially solid and wherein the layer comprises a combination of GRUBER ET AL. with STREET. Accordingly, the rejection under §103 based STREET and GRUBER ET AL. should be withdrawn.

4. The §103 rejection based on STREET in view of GRUBER ET AL. and further in view of HEMMING

The examiner rejected claims 36 and 49 under §103 based on STREET in view of GRUBER ET AL. and further in view of HEMMING.

However, as discussed above under heading 3, the underlying rejection based on STREET and GRUBER ET AL. is incorrect and should be withdrawn. HEMMING does not fill the deficiencies of STREET and GRUBER ET AL. Accordingly, the rejection including HEMMING as a tertiary reference should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited.

Serial No.:10/031,302

No fee is believed to be due; however, should any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, or should an overpayment be included herein, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct or credit said fees from or to Deposit Account No. 10-1205/ADVA:011.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert M. O'Keefe

Reg. No. 35,630

Attorney for Applicants

O'KEEFE, EGAN & PETERMAN, LLP 1101 Capital of Texas Highway So. Building C, Suite 200 Austin, Texas 78746 512/347-1611

FAX: 512/347-1615